

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

SYNOPSYS, INC.,

Plaintiff,

v.

RICOH CO., LTD.,

Defendant.

\_\_\_\_\_  
RICOH CO., LTD.,

Plaintiff,

v.

AEROFLEX, et al.,

Defendants.  
\_\_\_\_\_

No. C-03-2289 MJJ (EMC)

No. C-03-4669 MJJ (EMC)

**ORDER GRANTING SYNOPSYS' AND  
CUSTOMER DEFENDANTS'  
ADMINISTRATIVE MOTIONS FOR A  
SEALING ORDER; AND  
PROVISIONALLY GRANTING  
RICOH'S ADMINISTRATIVE  
REQUEST TO FILE CERTAIN  
DOCUMENTS AND EXHIBITS UNDER  
SEAL**

**(Docket No. 338, 352, 366, 370 in No. C-  
03-2289)**

**(Docket No. 475, 489, 505, 507 in No. C-03-  
4669)**

This order addresses the parties' requests to file under seal certain documents offered in support of or in opposition to Synopsys' and the Customer Defendants' motion to compel. The Court hereby orders as follows.

**A. Exhibits Attached to De Mory Declaration in Support of Motion to Compel**

Synopsys and the Customer Defendants' motion to seal Exhibits 41, 42, 47, 48, 49, and 53 attached to the De Mory declaration in support of the motion to compel is GRANTED. *See* Docket No. 338 in C-03-2289, Docket No. 475 in C-03-4669.

The Court PROVISIONALLY GRANTS Ricoh's request that Exhibits 3, 17, 27, 28, 29, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, and 38 also be filed under seal. *See* Docket No. 352 in C-03-2289, Docket No. 489 in

1 C-03-4669). The Court questions whether these documents (either in whole or in part) contain  
2 confidential information justifying a filing under seal. *See* Civ. L.R. 79-5(b). The Court therefore  
3 orders Ricoh to file a declaration explaining why there is good cause to seal these exhibits. The  
4 declaration shall be filed within a week of the filing date of this order. Said declaration may be filed  
5 under seal.

6 As an administrative matter, the Court notes that there is some confusion in the docket as to  
7 whether there is a publicly available redacted version of the De Mory declaration. Also, it does not  
8 appear that Exhibits 3, 17, 27, 28, 29, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, and 38 were lodged with the Court for filing  
9 under seal. Accordingly, the Court orders Synopsys and the Customer Defendants (1) to file a  
10 publicly available redacted version of the De Mory declaration consistent with this order and (2) to  
11 file under seal (provisionally) Exhibits 3, 17, 27, 28, 29, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, and 38.

12 B. Exhibits Attached to Brothers Declaration in Opposition to Motion to Compel

13 The Court PROVISIONALLY GRANTS Ricoh's request that Exhibits 2, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10 ,  
14 and 15 also be filed under seal. *See* Docket No. 366 in C-03-2289, Docket No. 505 in C-03-4669.  
15 The Court questions whether these documents (either in whole or in part) contain confidential  
16 information justifying a filing under seal. *See* Civ. L.R. 79-5(b). The Court therefore orders (1)  
17 Ricoh to file a declaration explaining why there is good cause to seal Exhibits 2, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, and 10  
18 and (2) Synopsys and the Customer Defendants to file a declaration explaining why there is good  
19 cause to seal Exhibit 15. The declarations shall be filed within a week of the filing date of this order.  
20 Said declarations may be filed under seal.

21 ///

22 ///

23 ///

24 ///

25 ///

26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

C. Reply and Exhibits Attached to De Mory Reply Declaration in Support of Motion to Compel  
Finally, Synopsys and the Customer Defendants' motion to seal the reply and Exhibits 2, 7, 8, 13 and 23 attached to the De Mory reply declaration in support of the motion to compel is GRANTED. *See* Docket No. 370 in C-03-2289, Docket No. 507 in C-03-4669.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: July 6, 2006



EDWARD M. CHEN  
United States Magistrate Judge